

REMARKS

Claims 23-45 are pending in this application. Of these pending claims, Claims 23-45 stand rejected.

The following remarks are believed to be fully responsive to the outstanding office action, and are believed to place the application in condition for allowance.

Background:

The present invention is directed to the delay of page numbers placement until a document is in a printer-ready file format. The invention provides flexibility in the process of printing page numbers on the pages of the document by including either flags, tags or markers that indicate which pages are going to contain page numbers. The flags, tags or markers are placed inside the printer-ready file format page and stored with the page in memory. At print time, the correct number is applied to the page. Therefore, if a new page or pages were added to a document, if a page or pages were deleted from the document or if a page or pages were moved around (reordered), the page numbering would still be correct.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 23-24, 26-35, and 37-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kremer et al. ('365) reference in view of the Duniho ('690) reference.

Independent claims 23 and 34 set forth a printing system and a method, respectively, wherein an operator can input a flag, a tag, or a marker to be associated with each page that is to be printed with a page number. A computer calculates the page numbers and modifies the document so that the proper pages to be printed receive proper page numbers.

Kremer et al. is directed to a printing system capable of inserting tab stock at specific points within a document. Flexibility of printing the tab contents on any one of the tab pages of an ordered set is provided by establishing a flag or marker indicating that a page contains a tab plus the information that needs to be rendered on the tab. The flag or marker is stored in a memory. This facilitates movement of this page around the document or copying of it to a different

document. The Examiner suggests that paragraph [0016], lines 1-5 of Kremer et al. discloses that *“each page to receive a page number when printed is provided with a flag, tag or marker,”* the cited passage discloses merely that a flag or marker is used only to indicate that a page contains a tab. Kremer et al. does not teach using a flag, tag or marker to indicate that a page is to receive a page number since the function of the Kremer et al. flag or marker is to identify only that a particular page contains a tab. In fact, Kremer et al. are clear that *“the final assembly has continuous page numbers added”* (paragraph [0027], lines 3-6). If the page numbering is continuous, there is no need for the use of flags or markers to identify those pages that are to have page numbers since there is no provision for pages without page numbers, and Dremer et al. actually teaches away from the present invention. The Examiner points to paragraph [0030], lines 4-9 for support, but that passage merely discloses that workstations may be used to modify documents to add features including *“adding page numbers across multiple documents, bates numbering, adjusting page layout for tab stock and aligning the output to account for binding.”* There is no suggestion in that, or any other passage of dremer et al. for providing a flag, tag or marker to each page to receive a page number.

According to the rejection, *“Kremer ‘365 discloses all the subject matter as described above [in the Office Action] except said job preparation station including an input device for a user to input the flag, tag or marker in association with each said page to receive a page number.”* Further according to the Rejection, Duniho ‘690 teaches a job preparation station including an input device for a user to input a flag, tag or marker in association with each page to receive a page number.

As explained above, Kremer et al. do not disclose all the subject matter set forth in claims 23 and 34 except said job preparation station including an input device for a user to input the flag, tag or marker in association with each said page to receive a page number. However, assuming arguendo that Kremer et al. did disclose that which the Examiner argues that it does, Duniho does not teach a job preparation station including an input device for a user to input a flag, tag or marker in association with each page to receive a page number. Duniho relates to a spreadsheet program that parses text strings for a header or footer of a page of a spreadsheet document. In computer science, parsing is the process of analyzing a

sequence of words to determine their grammatical structure with respect to a given formal grammar. Parsing source code creates some form of internal representation. While the header or footer may hold information such as page numbers, it does not allow for a user to input a flag, tag or marker in association with each page to receive a page number. It merely allows for the insertion of a header or footer that may contain a page number.

Assuming further that the combination of Kremer et al. and Duniho may be obvious, the result of the combined disclosures would be a printing system capable of establishing a flag or marker indicating that a page contains a tab plus the information that needs to be rendered on the tab. That information may be a page number. The combined disclosures would not teach using a flag, tag or marker to indicate that a page is to receive a page number.

Claims 24 and 26-33 depend directly or indirectly from claim 23 and are patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 23. Claims 35 and 37-44 depend directly or indirectly from claim 34 and are patentable at least for the same reasons as claim 34.

Claim 45 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kremer et al. ('365) reference and the Duniho ('690) reference in view of the Krist et al. ('351) reference.

According to the Rejection, "*Kremer et al. disclose all the subject matter as described above [in the Office Action] except wherein the electronic document page numbers are removed from certain pages and the electronic document is reprocessed by recalculating page numbers.*" Further according to the rejection, Krist et al. (EP 0 478 351 A2) teaches the claimed subject method step added by claim 45.

First, Kremer et al. in combination with Duniho do not disclose all of the claimed subject matter of claim 34. See the previous section of this response. Second, the Krist et al. patent is directed to a page numbering system in a printing system that generates page numbers and formats. Krist et al. allow for programming the page numbering format to skip non-document pages (not to number them). One example of a non-document page is a tab stock. According, a combination of the Kremer et al. teaching to identify the location for insertion of tab stock at a flag or marker with the teaching of not numbering tab stock pages Krist et al. would not suggest the use of a flag or marker to identify each page

intended to receive a page number.

Claims 25 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Kremer et al. and Duniho in view of Ghobrial et al. ('214).

According to the Final Rejection, "*Kremer '365 discloses all the subject matter as described above [in the Office Action] except wherein the pages of the document in the first printer ready file format are portable and pages of the document in the second printer ready file format are unportable.*" Further according to the Final Rejection, Ghobrial '214 teaches the claimed subject method step added by claims 25 and 36.


Kremer et al. in combination with Duniho do not disclose all of the claimed subject matter of claim 24 and 35. See the previous section of this response. Assuming arguendo that the references might be capable of combination, there is at least one limitation in the claimed invention that is not disclosed by the references individually or in combination. The primary reference fails to disclose the use of the flag or marker with other pages of the document to permit for calculation of page numbers for the document. Ghobrial et al. fails to disclose the information undisclosed by the primary reference.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that, in view of the above amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance, prompt notice of which is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned in the event that a phone interview will expedite prosecution of this application towards allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 45,287

William R. Zimmerli/rgd
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-2758
Facsimile: 585-477-1148

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at (585) 477-4656.